

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/025,509

Applicant(s)

KESSLER ET AL.

Examiner

Nadia Khoshnoodi

Art Unit

2137

All Participants:(1) Nadia Khoshnoodi.(2) Mr. Dan De Vos.**Status of Application:** First Action after RCE(3) Mr. Chris Mooney.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 January 2007**Time:** 12:00 PM**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 USC 101 rejections found in reference to all independent claims

Claims discussed:

all independent claims

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner noted that the claims have 35 USC 101 issues where if the issues are resolved claims 1-5 and 11-30 would be allowable over the cited prior arts of record. The independent claims as presented do not result in a tangible/useful result. However, if every independent claim is amended to include a limitation which establishes a secure connection between two entities by using the data generated based on the information supplied, the 35 USC 101 issues will be overcome. Furthermore, Examiner noted that claims 6-10 and 31-34 were not, as presented, patentably distinct over the prior art. Thus, Mr. De Vos suggested some amendments that would possibly put those claims in condition for allowance. Examiner mentioned that once the proposed amendments to the claims are received, an updated search must be conducted and the Examiner will need to also discuss the claims with a Primary Examiner before submitting the allowance with an Examiner's Amendment.